

have been the fact that the Republicans are actively sabotaging our current healthcare system.

Whether you are one of the more moderate Members on healthcare or are one of the ones who have a more broad, more sweeping proposal, it is the difference between the parties. Yet those differences almost pale compared to the differences between every Democrat on that platform and the Republicans, because the Republicans are seeking to undo healthcare, to sabotage healthcare, and to have fewer people covered. As a result of their ideas, thoughts, and lawsuits, costs are going up.

There is a huge gap between the parties on healthcare, and I am glad we are having an active debate on how to move forward to cover more people and have it cost less. While we are doing that, the Trump administration is doing the opposite. It is expanding junk insurance plans, reducing funds to help Americans locate and sign up for the right insurance, and ending cost-sharing payments that help low-income families afford care.

The congressional Republicans have tried and have, thankfully, failed to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The coup de grace, of course, is the fact that now the Trump administration—with the support of many Republican attorneys general and the complicity of just about every Member of the Senate on the Republican side—is supporting a lawsuit that would invalidate the Affordable Care Act entirely, which would kick tens of millions off of their insurance and eliminate the protections for preexisting conditions for the over 100 million Americans who have those preexisting conditions, and just about every Republican is going along with that.

The difference in the 2020 elections between the Democrats and the Republicans on healthcare will be apparent and glaring, and it will far and away subsume any differences we may have on policy.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Colorado.

#### BLM HEADQUARTERS RELOCATION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, several years back, at a committee hearing of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Director Neil Kornze of the Bureau of Land Management under the Obama administration was testifying before our committee on a regulation that was coming out of the BLM that most, if not all, of the county commissioners and various organizations in Colorado were opposed to. In fact, the opposition was so uniform in Colorado and throughout the West that I couldn't understand why the BLM was going forward with that regulation.

Out of frustration, at one point during the committee hearing, I said: Director Kornze, if you were just located in the West, if you were just out west, you would understand why this rule is a bad idea.

The response at the time, several years ago, was kind of a chuckle and a laugh, and, yes, well, we should talk about that.

It planted the seeds of an idea that actually was made into reality just last week with the announcement that the headquarters of the Bureau of Land Management will be moving out west and, indeed, to Grand Junction, CO.

This announcement was made on July 16, and I commend the efforts of Secretary Bernhardt and the Department of the Interior for listening to the people of the West.

This isn't a Republican issue. This isn't a partisan issue. In fact, this idea to move the BLM headquarters out to the land that it regulates and oversees has been embraced by Democrats and Republicans across Colorado and throughout the West.

They also talked about their intention in this announcement to reorganize the Bureau of Land Management and to relocate a significant number of headquarters jobs throughout the West, not just in Grand Junction but in Lakewood, CO, in Montana, in Utah, and beyond.

I think it is important to talk about the reasons why it makes so much sense to have this particular Agency located in Colorado, in the West.

Look at this map here. The red on this map is a combination of both mineral rights and surface lands. You can see the red. Forty-seven percent of all the land out west is where 93 percent of all Federal land is located. The Federal Government owns roughly 47 percent of this land out west. It is where 93 percent of the Federal land is located. Think about that. Ninety-three percent of all Federal land, here in the red, makes up 47 percent of the land ownership in the West.

Nationwide, the Bureau of Land Management is responsible for managing

approximately 700 million acres of Federal mineral estates located underground. That is the entire country, of course, but 245 million acres are surface acres, or Federal surface lands. All but 100,000 acres of those surface acres—all but 100,000 of those acres—are west of the Mississippi River, and located predominantly in the 11 westernmost States and Alaska.

One of the frustrations I hear from local and county officials and environmental activists and farmers and ranchers is that when they deal with their BLM local field office, they seem to have a very good experience that people are working together to solve problems, and they like the conversations they have and the cooperation they are getting from the local and regional offices. But something happens when that decision-making process then moves to Washington, DC. Something happens, and all of a sudden the conversation and communication can stop. It changes. All of a sudden, the outcomes aren't what they thought they would be based on those local, productive conversations.

We have seen directives and management decisions coming more from Washington, DC, lately, instead of from the local field offices, where people know their communities best and understand the land best. So what happens is that the deep pockets and special interests in Washington often carry the day, make the convincing arguments, thousands of miles removed from where the Federal and the public land actually is.

That is why it is important to have this BLM move. It changes that. Instead of having special interests in Washington, in a community that has none of these public lands located in it, you are able to make that decision right here, in Colorado, surrounded by public lands, in a community that is defined by the public lands that they oversee.

I believe government is going to work better when it is local, when local decision makers are closest to the land that the decisions they are making affect the most. That is why this decision is so important—whether it is issues of withdrawal of locatable minerals or the reduction of grazing permits; the concept of multiple use over time; the idea that we can use this land for preservation, conservation, or that we can use it for energy development, or that we can use it for grazing. That has somehow fallen out of favor.

My friend Greg Walcher, who is a former Senate staffer for Senator Armstrong, who used to head the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, wrote an op-ed about this point, pointing out that the multiple-use mandate includes managing 18,000 grazing permits, 220 wilderness areas, 27 national monuments, 600 national conservation areas, 200,000 miles of streams, 2,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers, 6,000 miles of national scenic trails, 63,000 oil and gas wells, 25,000 mines, and 50 million acres of forests.

Not a square inch of that is in Washington, DC. It is in the 12 Western States: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. It has never made sense for leadership to work 2,000 miles away from these States, insulated by the inevitably different perspectives of life inside the beltway. That is what is so important about this decision.

When you don't live in the communities that are among and surrounded by these lands, it is easy to make decisions that close off energy development or close cattle ranches and grazing opportunities, because the consequences are felt out west instead of in Washington, DC.

But this strong push by westerners—SCOTT TIPTON, myself, Secretary Zinke, and others—began the conversation about modernization and the organizational structure for the next 100 years of the Bureau of Land Management, and I appreciate Secretary Bernhardt's decision to make this happen.

Grand Junction, where the new BLM will be located, is an incredibly beautiful place, with people who are so supportive of this decision—a community that knows that when these decision makers are in their community, they are not going to have to drive hours or take a flight for 4 hours out of Washington to see BLM lands. Just to look out the window and to see the lands they manage will result in better decision making.

Mesa County, where Grand Junction is located, is the county seat. It is 73 percent Federal land, 46 percent of which is managed by the BLM. In total, the BLM manages 8.3 million acres of surface in Colorado and 27 million acres of Federal mineral estates in Colorado.

But we are not the only State that will benefit, obviously. There are a lot of other positions that will be moving across the country to the State and to the location where those jobs are a best fit. It makes sense.

I know sometimes people think that Washington is the only place where people can do government's work or where people can find the kind of skilled workforce. That is one of the arguments that has actually been made against the BLM move—that only Washington has the skilled workforce able to do these jobs.

Look, I am sorry, if you don't want to live in the counties and communities surrounded by public lands. Then, why are you working for a public land management agency?

So I am excited about this. I thank the good people with the Secretary of the Interior who made this decision happen and the community of Grand Junction, which supported this from day one.

In the same op-ed that Mr. Walcher wrote, he opened with a quote and said this: "There is something more powerful than the brute force of bayonets: It is the idea whose time has come."

That is where we have finally arrived today, an idea whose time has come, locating the decision makers who affect our western communities the most out in the western United States.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to talk about this decision. I commend the Secretary of the Interior for doing what is right by our public lands, and I will continue to stand up for public lands throughout this process.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, an unusual event occurred yesterday in the Environment and Public Works Committee—a major bill reauthorizing America's transportation infrastructure for 5 years passed the committee by a 21-to-0 vote. That is the way we should be able to operate on a subject that I think enjoys universal support in the Senate; that is, making sure the Federal partnership for infrastructure is not only reauthorized but also increased because we know the infrastructure needs of this country have only gotten more challenging.

I want to start by complimenting the leadership of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Chairman BARRASSO and Ranking Member CARPER worked very closely together on this bill, including the input of all members of the committee as well as Members of the Senate.

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, chaired by Senator CAPITO, and I am the ranking Democrat on the committee, also worked very well in developing this Transportation Infrastructure Reauthorization Act.

As I pointed out originally, the needs are urgent, and the leadership of the committee recognized that. In every one of our States, we know the unmet needs of infrastructure, maintaining our existing infrastructure, and replacing our bridges that are falling down, dealing with our transit systems, dealing with the needs to deal with congestion.

We know there are so many issues out there, and it is important for us to give a clear signal that we intend to have a long-term reauthorization, 5 years, so there is predictability, so our States and local governments know that these projects that require longer term planning will have a Federal partner that is available and reliable.

It also increases the funding, the first year by 10 percent and increases it by certain percentages thereafter, recognizing we need to do more. There are several new initiatives building on existing programs that I think are worthy of mentioning.

Let me just go over a few of the real highlights of this infrastructure bill. First, it has a climate change title. This is the first time we have done this—a separate title to deal with the realities of climate change.

I need only remind my colleagues of what happened this month in Maryland when we had 4 inches of rain that flooded Maryland roads. We have to deal with the realities. We have to deal with resiliency and adaptation in regard to what is happening with climate change. This title deals with that.

Transportation is the leading source of greenhouse gas emissions. We need infrastructure that deals with the realities of reducing carbon emissions. This title provides for financial help for building an infrastructure for electric and alternative fuel vehicles. That is a reality of consumer desire as well as dealing with the realities of climate change.

We give local discretion for funds to initiate emission reduction strategies. That could include simple things like providing alternatives for the use of our cars for people who want to walk and bike rather than having to get into their cars. It is a major commitment for which we are going to provide resources, in partnership with local governments, to deal with the realities of our responsibility in the transportation sector to reduce carbon emissions.

We also deal with the realities of congestion. I can tell the Presiding Officer, as I told my colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee, that I face it every day twice a day. I commute from Baltimore here to work and have to deal with the realities of congestion.

It has been estimated that the delays caused by congestion and the excessive fuels that are used by congestion cost our economy over \$300 billion every year. So there is not only a quality-of-life issue involved in our taking on congestion, there is also an economic reason to take on the issues of congestion.

Of course, it is also linked to our commitment to deal with the climate change issues by reducing unnecessary fuel consumption, which adds to carbon emissions.

The legislation provides funding for new initiatives so that we can get solutions to deal with the problems of congestion, the multimobile solutions that are available in many communities. We work and allow the locals to give us ideas and help fund those to reduce congestion.

As I mentioned earlier, we have a real challenge on dealing with our bridges. Many of our bridges are in need of replacement. Many are in need of desperate repair. I can mention many in Maryland. In the southern part of our State, we have the Nice Bridge and the Johnson Bridge, both in need of replacement or repair. This legislation provides additional resources to deal with bridges in our country.

There are certain highways that have been built that no longer really serve the function—or may never serve the function—of moving people from one area to another but instead are dividing communities. So the legislation

has a unique section that allows us to identify those types of highways that are no longer needed and that are dividing and isolating communities so we can get those highways removed.

I am proud that this legislation builds on the Transportation Alternative Program that I helped author on the reauthorization bill with my partner Senator WICKER. I thank him for his help. It allows for much more local discretion on how transportation funds are spent. It allows local communities to have a source of Federal support to deal with local safety issues, for developing trails for pedestrian and bike paths so that the quality of life and safety of the local community are taken into consideration on the use of Federal highway funds.

It provides flexibility to local government. In the first year, we provide \$1.2 billion for transportation alternative programs with a steady growth in the ensuing 4 years.

I also want to acknowledge the section in the bill that deals with freight traffic. It is a growing field. We expect it to continue to grow. There are funds that are provided in here to deal with the realities of moving freight through our highway surface transportation system.

In that regard, I was pleased that this past week we were able to announce an INFRA grant for Maryland of \$125 million for the Howard Street Tunnel. This is a tunnel that is 120 years old and runs through Baltimore. The replacement of this tunnel will allow for double stacking of rail freight, which is what you need to do today if you are going to have efficiency and be economically competitive. This grant will help us replace that tunnel and help create more jobs in Baltimore, in Maryland, and in our entire region of the country and will provide for more efficiencies on truck traffic.

I say that because, today, because of the inefficiencies of rail, we have trucks that are stacked up in the Port of Baltimore, which is inefficient for the truck operators and, again, adds to the climate problems of excessive use of fuels.

There is a section in here that deals with safety, as we should. In 2017, 37,000 people died in our transportation areas. We need to improve that. There are some important provisions in this legislation that deal with safety issues.

The bill also deals with reauthorizing the Appalachian Regional Commission. I particularly thank Senator CAPITO for her leadership on this issue. Reauthorization is important for the entire region, including the western part of the State of Maryland.

This is the first step—and I hope a successful step—for the completion of the reauthorization of surface transportation by this Congress before the end of this year. I hope we can get it moving. I hope we can get it enacted, certainly, in time, so there is no lapse in Federal partnerships dealing with transportation.

I know we have other committees that need to act on a comprehensive transportation bill. Many of us serve on those other committees. If we follow the example of the Environment and Public Works Committee—21 to 0—if we listen to each other, if we do that, we can succeed in passing a strong reauthorization of surface transportation that will help modernize America's transportation needs, which will be good for our economy, good for our environment, and good for the quality of life of all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to follow that example, and let's get this work done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

#### ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as those who are following on C-SPAN have probably noted, we are not overwhelmed with business on the floor of the U.S. Senate, nor have we been during the course of this year.

We have considered several bills—you could count them on one hand—including the Defense authorization bill, and, of course, the momentous, historic legislation 2 weeks ago, the tax treaty with Luxembourg, which had been pending before the U.S. Senate for 9 years. It finally made it to the floor of the Senate. That was the highlight of the week, as we have watched the U.S. Senate ignore some of the most important issues of our time.

Let me tell you one that strikes at the heart of our democracy, which we should be focused on today and until it is resolved. Last week, former FBI Director and Special Counsel Bob Mueller testified before the House Judiciary Committee about his report on Russian interference in the 2016 election. The hearing clarified several important things. For example, President Trump loves to claim that the Mueller report completely exonerated him. Trump's tweets, one after another, talk about how he was exonerated by that report. Director Mueller made clear that is "not what the report said."

When asked by the House Judiciary chairman "Did you actually totally exonerate the President?" Director Mueller answered "no."

President Trump likes to say the Mueller investigation was a witch hunt. He has said that about 1,000 times. But the investigation actually led to 37 indictments and over \$42 million in assets forfeited to the government. If this were a witch hunt, it certainly found a lot of wealthy witches.

Some Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee tried to attack Director Mueller's credibility, but Mueller has a lifetime record of being a straight shooter, by-the-book investigator, and prosecutor. He did this country a service when he took on the role of special counsel.

One thing Director Mueller tried to remind the American people of is the reason the investigation was necessary. He said:

Over the course of my career, I have seen a number of challenges to our democracy. The Russian government's effort to interfere in our election is among the most serious.

Mueller went on to say: "This deserves the attention of every American."

One of the most important takeaways from the Mueller report is that Russia did successfully attack our democracy in 2016. Page 1 of the Mueller report says: "The Russian Government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion."

The report detailed numerous examples, including an "intelligence-gathering mission" that employees of the Internet Research Agency, known as the IRA, took in June of 2014.

The IRA was the Russian troll farm that waged information warfare against the 2016 election by using stolen identities, fake social media accounts, and fake campaign events.

The Mueller report and the earlier indictment of several IRA employees noted that two of the Russians arrived in the United States for a 3-week trip "for the purpose of collecting intelligence to inform the [IRA's] operations."

The report also detailed the Russians' attack on my own home State board of elections. In July 2016, the Illinois State board of elections discovered that it was the target of a malicious, month-long cyber attack that enabled the intruder to access confidential voter information and view the registration data of approximately 76,000 voters in my State of Illinois.

These efforts to influence the election and attack campaign organizations and State and local election administrators and vendors continue to this day. What are we going to do about it?

What has been the response so far of the U.S. Senate, the body sworn to uphold the Constitution and to protect against enemies, foreign and domestic? Nothing. We are too busy with the trade treaty with Luxembourg to deal with Russian interference in our elections. In the face of Russia's threat to our elections, this Senate has been quiet as a graveyard.

Let's start in 2016. Top officials from the administration's national security and intelligence community came and warned congressional leadership of Russia's ongoing attack on our elections, rightly asking for a bipartisan statement to tell Russian dictator Putin to stop. What was Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL's response to this obvious request to protect our Nation? He said: No thanks. I am not going to do it.

History will no doubt look back in infamy at that decision.

What about the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a historically recognized body with key jurisdiction over Russian attacks on the United States? That committee did not even conduct an investigation into Russia's actions in the last Congress.

Republicans were silent when Trump repeatedly accepted Russian dictator Vladimir Putin's brazen denials over American intelligence experts and all of the evidence to the contrary.

They were silent again after the Mueller report's devastating findings of Russian interference. And they were silent when President Trump subsequently said he would gladly accept election help from a foreign power again.

Now look at the current Congress. Several bipartisan bills have been introduced to respond to this Russian threat, including the Election Security Act. This is a critical, comprehensive bill that would provide States with much needed resources and establish a robust Federal effort to protect our democracy.

Unfortunately, Republican Senate Leader McConnell is blocking all efforts to bring this important legislation to the floor for a debate and vote. This legislation could thwart Russian interference in the 2020 election. Senator McConnell refuses to bring it to the floor.

I end with the questions I have asked before here on the floor: How can the party of Ronald Reagan continue to sit by while this President pursues policies aligned with the former KGB agent, Vladimir Putin? Why didn't the first bills in this new Senate under Republican control deal with this threat to the election process in our democracy? Why isn't the Senate Foreign Relations Committee holding urgent hearings on these stunning dalliances between an American President and a Russian dictator? Why isn't the Senate Foreign Relations Committee moving bipartisan legislation that would protect U.S. membership in NATO?

Quite frankly, we barely do anything in this legislative graveyard of the Senate under Republican control. You would think we would at least focus, on a bipartisan basis, on making certain that the outcome of the next election is not influenced by a foreign power, whether it is Russia or some other malicious force in the world today.

But because it bruises the President's ego and it may invoke a nasty tweet, the Republican-controlled Senate prefers to do nothing. It is time for the Republican majority to stop protecting President Trump at all costs.

There reaches a point when the Senate Republican leadership needs to put the country before fear of the President's tweets.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, can you hear it? Can you hear the somber notes, the feet shuffling, and the solemn tones? Can you hear it? It is a dirge, a funeral march, and it is the death of a movement—a once proud movement with hundreds of thousands of people gathered on the National Mall. It is the death and it is the last

gasps of a movement in America that was concerned with our national debt.

Today is the final nail in the coffin. The tea party is no more. The budget deal today allows unlimited borrowing for nearly 2 years—unlimited, no limits—and the government will borrow what they wish without limit for 2 years. It abolishes all spending caps. Adoption of this deal marks the death of the tea party movement in America. Fiscal conservatives—those who remain—should be in mourning for Congress. Both parties have deserted you.

The national debt now stands at \$22 trillion. This year, we will add over \$1.2 trillion. We are approaching record deficits, and neither party cares. Both parties have deserted, have absolutely and utterly deserted America and have shown no care and no understanding and no sympathy for the burden of debt they are leaving the taxpayers, the young, the next generation, and the future of our country.

The very underpinnings of our country are being eroded and threatened by this debt. The interest on this debt will be over \$400 billion next year—precisely, \$455 billion. Interest will surpass all welfare spending in the next 2 years. Interest on the debt will surpass defense spending by 2025.

Social Security is \$7 trillion in debt. Medicare is over \$30 trillion in debt. Yet a parade of candidates on national television last night said they want to double and triple the government's expenditures where the government is already trillions of dollars short. Whose fault is this? Both parties.

The media completely doesn't get it. The media says: Oh, there is not enough compromise in Washington. That is exactly the opposite of the truth. There is too much compromise in Washington. There is always an agreement to spend more money. There is always an agreement to spend money we don't have. There is always an agreement to borrow your kids' and your grandkids' money and to put this country further at risk.

Admiral Mullen put it this way. He said the most significant threat to our national security is our debt. Yet all around me on my side of the aisle are those who clamor and say: Our military is hollowed out and can't complete its mission. Well, perhaps the mission is too big for the budget. Maybe it is not a problem of having enough money; maybe it is a problem of making our mission to be everything to everyone around the world, to have spent \$50 billion a year building roads and bridges in Afghanistan for the last 20 years and to continue that forever.

When the President put forward a proposal, a thought that we might try to end and to declare victory in Afghanistan, this body—both parties rose up as one, and the vast majority said it would be precipitous to leave Afghanistan after 19 years.

This is the problem. It isn't acrimony. It isn't both parties fighting each other. It is both parties agreeing

to increase the debt. They increase the debt for different reasons, but the only way they get theirs—"give me mine, give me mine" is what both sides say. The right wants for the military. Yet we spend more on the military than the next 10 countries combined. We spend more on the military—the United States spends more than all of NATO combined. All of the NATO countries combined spend less than we do on the military.

People say we are hollowed out and we can't complete our mission. Well, maybe the mission is too big. It isn't that the budget is too small; it is that the mission is too big. Maybe we don't need to have troops in 50 of 55 African countries. Maybe we need to rethink our mission. Maybe the mission of the military should be to defend our country, not to intervene in every civil war around the world.

Admiral Mullen said the most significant threat to our national security is our debt. Yet we are piling on more debt, saying we need more military. Maybe we need to discuss the mission of our military. We are piling on more debt, some in the name of national security. Yet I think it weakens us with every moment.

The vote today will be on a 2-year debt ceiling with no limits. The details do matter. Raising the debt ceiling with no limits would be like telling your kid: OK, you can have a credit card, but there will be no limits on what you spend. Just spend it on whatever you want, in whatever amount, and in 2 years, I will just pay the bill for you.

Nobody would do that with their family money, and no country should act that way. We can't keep going on like this.

Where are all the fiscal conservatives? What happened to the tea party movement, which was bipartisan and was concerned citizens rising up and saying: I don't want something from government. What I want is a government that is responsible, a government that spends what comes in, a government that doesn't keep borrowing and borrowing and borrowing and putting us further at risk.

What happened to that movement? That movement elected some of these people. You heard these people. Don't you remember, when President Obama was President, the Republicans all clamoring and saying "trillion-dollar deficits" for multiple years. Every year, they would say: President Obama wants to spend and borrow and spend and borrow. I heard it in my State. I heard it from the very people who today will vote for this monstrosity.

Some of them will actually vote for my amendment to give themselves cover. They will say: Oh, yeah, I was for the Paul amendment. But then they are also going to vote for the deal that will bankrupt our country. What happened to these people? They all thought debt was bad when it was President Obama's debt, but they are

not ecumenical, and they are not very much into self-examination. They are not interested in the debt now that Republicans are complicit.

But before we make this about Republicans, remember that there is not a Democrat in Washington who cares about the debt. The difference between the parties is that the Democrats are honest. They are very honest. They don't care about the debt. Look, they are all over the stage, falling all over themselves, trying to give free healthcare to illegal aliens. They are all on the stage trying to talk about giving Medicare for All when we can't even afford the Medicare for Some. So Democrats don't care. The country should know that Democrats do not care about the debt. But here is the problem: The only opposition party we have in the country is the Republican Party, and they don't care either. They just come home, and they are dishonest and tell you they care, and then they vote for a monstrosity.

Today's vote will be a vote for a monstrosity, an abomination, the ability to borrow money for over 2 years until guess what intervenes. Why are we going to wait 2 years with no limits on borrowing? There is this little thing called an election. They don't want to be in public voting to raise the debt ceiling an unlimited amount or a vast amount again, so they are putting it off to beyond the election. Both parties are complicit, though. Nobody wants to vote on this again.

People talk about draining the swamp. You can't drain the swamp unless you are willing to cut the size and scope of government. That is the swamp. The swamp is this morass that is millions of people up here organized to involve themselves in the economy. Most of them could disappear from government, and no one would notice. The only thing you would notice is less money coming to Washington and more money remaining in the States.

It is a little bit of what happened with the tax cut. But in addition to the tax cut returning to people their own money, we should also quit spending money we don't have up here. During the tax cut, I, for one, said: You have to cut spending. I offered amendments during the tax cut to cut spending. Do you know what happened? I got four votes. Four people in the Senate cared about the debt on that particular vote.

After we passed the tax cut, there is a provision that says there will be automatic spending cuts if the taxes were to bring in less revenue. Guess what. I forced a vote to keep that rule in place. I got nine votes because most people don't care.

No Democrat cares about the debt. The Republicans falsely tell you they care, and the vast majority will vote for this monstrosity today.

Today, I will offer an alternative. Some say: Well, you conservatives won't vote to raise the debt ceiling at all, and we will go bankrupt, there will be turmoil in the markets, and it will

be a disaster. So what I am offering for conservatives today is that we will raise the debt ceiling under a couple of conditions. We will raise the debt ceiling if you adopt, in advance, significant spending cuts, caps on spending, and a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

See, here is the road, and here is, I guess, the beginning and the end of the dishonesty around here. If we had a vote today, we would have some people saying: Why don't we vote on the balanced budget amendment?

We all love to vote for it. We don't really mean it. We don't really care about balancing the budget. We are not for it because we are Big Government Republicans. But we love to vote for the balanced budget amendment because I can go home and tell people: Yeah, I voted for the really crazy, monstrous budget deal to expand the debt, but I also voted for the balanced budget amendment.

Well, here is our deal. We don't want to vote on the balanced budget amendment; we want adoption of the balanced budget amendment. So if you will cut spending, if you will cap spending, and if you will pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, I will vote to raise the debt ceiling—but only if those things are done.

People say: Well, if we don't raise the debt ceiling without any reform, the country—the markets will go into turmoil. Well, guess what. We bring in \$3 trillion, and we spend \$4 trillion. What does that mean? We can pay for \$3 trillion on a daily basis without borrowing. So if tomorrow we didn't raise the debt ceiling, what would happen? We would spend \$3 trillion. Every Social Security check could go out, every soldier could be paid, and everybody on Medicare could be taken care of. That is probably about it, to tell you the truth, because we spend too much damn money. We spend money we don't have. But you could provide the essentials to people—Social Security, Medicare, pay our soldiers, and maybe a few other things—if you just spent what came in.

Isn't that what we should do? Isn't that what responsible people do? Does any American family routinely spend a third—25 percent more than comes in? Does anybody spend \$4 for every \$3 that comes in? Nobody does that. Nobody in their right mind does that, but your government does it. And who is at fault? Both parties. They are complicit. They scratch each other's backs. They both are terrible on the deficit. Both parties are bad. Both parties are ruining our country.

My amendment is called cut, cap, and balance—cuts spending, puts caps back in place that they can't exceed, and says that if we vote now on a balanced budget amendment and if it passes and if it is sent to the States, then we would raise the debt ceiling.

Most people around here don't want any linkage. It is not that they will just complain that my budgetary re-

forms are too harsh; they will complain that they don't want any. So there won't be any alternative. There won't be someone saying: Well, those are too much, and we would rather have just a little bit. No, they don't want any restraint. The budget monstrosity, the deal, the abomination we will vote on today will have no limits—no dollar limits.

I was arguing this last week on another particular issue, and from across the country, I got reamed by the left-wing mob who says: Why are you doing is this? Why couldn't you do it on another matter?

We do it on every matter. Those of us who are fiscally conservative are saying that we shouldn't spend money we don't have. I am doing it again this week, saying that we should not spend money we don't have, that it is irresponsible, and that we are eroding the very foundation that has made America great.

I will vote against this budget deal. I will present cut, cap, and balance. Cut, cap, and balance is a responsible way to raise the debt ceiling by cutting spending, capping spending, and also passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I hope my colleagues will consider that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from South Dakota.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I love the month of August, and I think I have always loved the month of August going back to the time when I was a kid because, obviously, growing up in South Dakota, August is a great month of the year. It is hot. There are a lot of activities. Of course, it is the month before or, in some cases, it is the month of returning to school, but it is a time in which there are lots of things going on in my home State of South Dakota, and especially since becoming a Member of Congress, I really love August.

I head back home to South Dakota almost every weekend to meet with South Dakotans, but August is wonderful and different for two reasons. One reason is, August gives us an extended work period, a time when we get a chance to visit the farthest corners of our State, places that might be hard to visit on just a weekend—places such as Bison, Milbank, Clear Lake, Huron, and Mobridge. I get to talk to people who make their living in production agriculture in some of the most rural parts of South Dakota. There is nothing more valuable than getting to talk to these South Dakotans firsthand and to hear the challenges they face and what we can do here in Washington to help out—not to mention how wonderful it is to spend time in these beautiful parts of our State. If you haven't taken in the rugged beauty of the Badlands or the rivers and prairies of Central South Dakota, then you are missing out.

The other thing I like about heading back to South Dakota in August is

that it is fair season—the Sioux Empire Fair, the Turner County Fair, the Brown County Fair, Central States Fair, Yankton Riverboat Days, and powwows in Tribal communities around the State. The list literally goes on. You would be hard-pressed to find better events, better people, or better food. I often joke that in the month of August, I am basically eating my way across South Dakota: ice cream at the fair in Parker, pork sandwiches with the pork producers, milkshakes at Dakotafest, cheese curds at the State fair, and I can go on.

I vividly remember the year I had a Tubby Burger plus a big fries, plus to go with it a malt at the Brown County Fair, and got up early the next morning to run the 5K at Riverboat Days in Yankton. Needless to say, it was not my best run time, but it was worth it for the Tubby Burger.

There is really nothing better than a South Dakota road trip. Our State has so much to offer, an incredible range of scenery, from rolling prairies to the heights of Black Elk Peak, and hundreds of miles of wide-open country. There is nothing better than a summer afternoon driving down a South Dakota highway. You feel like you can see, literally, forever.

We have an incredible number of outdoor opportunities, from fishing and hunting to hiking, biking, rock climbing, water sports. You name it; in South Dakota, we have it.

South Dakota is an affordable place for families to visit as well. You are not going to break the bank on meals or lodging. Of course, we have unforgettable road trip stops like the Corn Palace in Mitchell or Wall Drug. Make sure, if you get to Wall Drug, that you grab a homemade doughnut or a glass of free ice water and take a picture on Instagram with the giant jackalope outside.

As for South Dakotans, well, they are the nicest people you are ever going to meet. A South Dakota road trip is worth it for the people alone. In addition to the wonderful memories I made traveling across the State as an adult, I cherish my memories of the trips to the Black Hills as a child with my parents and siblings. We used to go out there for Labor Day, stay in this little non-air-conditioned cabin, and enjoy the outdoors. We would hike and visit the caves, go to Mount Rushmore, or visit the lake.

I still love visiting Sylvan Lake in the Black Hills. I loved being there with my parents and siblings, and I love taking my daughters there on trips like the ones I took growing up. Nobody who visits South Dakota should miss the Black Hills. I am not sure there is a more beautiful place on Earth—the interplay of light, shadow on the trees and rocks late on a summer afternoon, the endless South Dakota sky reflected in the clear blue of Sylvan Lake. People in Washington, DC, don't know what the Milky Way looks like on a clear night in the Black

Hills or on the prairies of South Dakota. It is as if the sky had been carpeted with millions of diamonds.

I am lucky to be a son of South Dakota. I am looking forward to getting out of Washington, DC, this week and heading back to my home State of South Dakota for some of the best weeks of the year.

Brown County, if you are listening to this, please save me a Tubby Burger.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEDICARE FOR ALL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the past several months, we have heard a lot of talk about Medicare for All. Its Democratic supporters claim this is the panacea that will solve all of America's healthcare woes. They say it will guarantee every person's access to healthcare and simplify our healthcare system, but it doesn't take much effort to see the flaws in their proposal and in their argument—something we are obligated to do, to examine these proposals to see whether they will work or not.

Our Democratic friends proudly own the fact that Medicare for All would completely end employer-based health insurance as we know it. We heard that a lot last night during the debates of the Democratic candidates running for President. It would literally force every American into one government-run plan modeled after our current Medicare system.

Part of the problem is, seniors have paid into the Medicare system for many years, and we know it is on a path to insolvency unless Congress does something. Medicare for All would only make that worse, expanding it to every eligible American.

According to a Kaiser poll released yesterday, more than three-quarters of Americans favor employer-sponsored health insurance, and 86 percent of people with employer coverage rate their insurance positively. That would include, again, as we heard last night, many union members who have been part of the collective bargaining agreement with their employers, with management, to negotiate outstanding, quality private health insurance. That would go away under Medicare for All.

We know that about 83-percent of the people polled support our current Medicare system for our seniors, and a whopping 95 percent of people with Medicare coverage are happy with it, but if Medicare for All becomes the law of the land, those numbers would plummet because Medicare would be unrecognizable to the seniors who paid into the fund and who have earned that coverage.

Families would lose all freedom when it comes to making their own healthcare choices. You see a government-selected doctor at a government-selected facility. We know what that looks like in the United Kingdom and in Canada, where people have to wait in long lines just to get seen by their doctor, much less elective surgery. You get the coverage the government says you deserve at the time, when the government says you can have it. It would completely hollow out the existing Medicare Program and inject unfathomable instability into America's healthcare system.

If you get past all of that, which is hard to do, you certainly will not be able to stomach the price. Medicare for All, it is estimated, would cost taxpayers \$32 trillion over the first 10 years alone. Now, credit BERNIE SANDERS, our colleague from Vermont. He is honest enough to acknowledge that he is going to have to raise taxes on the middle class to pay for that, but \$32 trillion is a lot of money, especially when our current debt exceeds \$20 trillion already and is growing. When it comes to how they would pay for it, the only answer we hear from everybody other than BERNIE SANDERS is, "Let's just tax the rich."

This is part of their usual talking points and part of the Democratic Party's incredible sprint to the left and their shocking embrace of a socialist agenda.

We saw the start of their move toward socialized medicine in 2009 with ObamaCare. We famously recall President Obama trying to reassure people that if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it, and if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor—none of which proved to be true.

Now Democrats want to make these extravagant promises about Medicare for All, which we know they cannot keep. It is clear ObamaCare was just the beginning. Medicare for All, or the public option, so to speak, which some people try to tout as an alternative, is nothing but a government competition for private health insurance, and you can't beat the Federal Government, especially when it is paid for by Federal tax dollars. That is a march toward the elimination of private health insurance, including that provided through your employer, which now benefits about 180 million Americans.

Last night, we saw candidates defend these radical policies during the Democratic debate. Two of our Senate colleagues who are running for President sparred over what another candidate called "fairytale" promises. They fought to defend their plan to remove all choice from Americans' healthcare. They tried to convince their fellow Democrats and the American people that they are writing a check that, if elected, they can cash.

We know that is not true. The American people are not going to be fooled. They don't want socialized medicine; they don't want to run up government



spending; they certainly don't want to have to pay \$32 trillion in additional taxes to pay for it; and they certainly don't want Washington bureaucrats dictating their families' healthcare choices.

In a speech last week, the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Seema Verma, spoke about these radical healthcare ideas. She said: "These proposals are the largest threats to the American healthcare system."

Let me say that again. Seema Verma, head of CMS, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, called these proposals "the largest threats" to America's healthcare system. So you better believe we will keep fighting to resist this socialist agenda and this evermore liberal wish list.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Mr. President, on another matter, we will soon be able to vote on a bipartisan, 2-year budget agreement to provide some certainty and stability to the Federal Government and Federal spending. The President and Speaker PELOSI have reached this deal in order to avoid the possibility of another government shutdown and instead leave time and space for a wide-ranging debate on our government spending habits.

I know the Presiding Officer believes as I do; that it is past time to have a genuine, far-ranging debate about government spending habits that is not just focused on discretionary spending, which is what this budget caps deal does, but on all the money the Federal Government spends, which includes the 70 percent of spending which is on autopilot, which this deal does not discuss or deal with.

I will be the first to admit this budget agreement isn't perfect. It never is. Anything negotiated means both sides have to give up a little bit in order to find common ground. As I indicated, I certainly wish it were more aggressive. I wish it did something to deal with our entitlement programs as we continue to face growing deficits, but I am glad to see that the agreement offsets roughly a 1-year increase for non-defense discretionary spending above current law and allows our government to be funded on time and on budget.

It also avoids 30 poison pill policy riders on everything from taxpayer funding for abortion to immigration law, keeping them from reaching the President's desk.

Above all, this agreement delivers on our most fundamental responsibility, which is to provide for our common defense. When our friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, first came here, he said: I am a conservative, which means there are really two things that take priority when it comes to the Federal Government. One is national defense, and the other is infrastructure. He said everything else comes below that on the priority list. I found a lot of wisdom in those words. Providing for the common defense is the most impor-

tant thing Congress does, along with the administration.

We know under the previous administration, the Pentagon and our national defense were underfunded dramatically. It operated without any kind of stability or predictability, and this took a serious toll on our military readiness.

After nearly a decade of neglect, President Trump and Senate Republicans are working to rebuild our military and rebuild that readiness and modernize our force.

Let's look at the Army Future Vertical Lift—or FVL—as an example of why this investment is so very important. FVL is a cross-functional team within Army Futures Command headquarters in Austin, TX, that aims to develop two new helicopters for the Army in the 2020s. These next-generation aircraft will replace aging military helicopters and provide our servicemembers with the capabilities they need today and tomorrow.

But right now, these programs are progressing without timely funding. It is hard to make plans when you don't know how the money is going to flow. Without a budget deal and on-time appropriations, the Army has no choice but to significantly delay these programs for years to come, meaning that the Army will continue to operate helicopters built in the seventies and eighties.

The same goes with our artillery. Those years of underfunding have allowed Russia and China to surpass our capabilities in a number of areas, including long-range precision fire. In this and other areas, the military must develop longer range weapons to provide an advantage over our adversaries and maintain our qualitative edge.

As a newer program, the Army would not be able to continue research, development, and testing under a continuing resolution or without a budget deal, putting us another year behind in modernizing our force in an era of great power competition. That means China and Russia continue apace while we are slow to try to catch up.

That is why this deal is so important. It provides stable and reliable funding so that our military leaders can plan for the future and provide for the common defense.

Our newly confirmed Defense Secretary, Mark Esper, talked about this at length when testifying before the Armed Services Committee a couple of weeks ago. He talked about the Department of Defense receiving funding on time last year and said that it really allowed us to accelerate the readiness gains we have made to advance our modernization efforts and to do all of the things the national defense strategy tells us we need to do.

You would think there would be broad bipartisan support for providing America's military with the necessary resources to keep the American people safe. Somehow, though, some of our Members believe that this critical national security mission is optional.

Unfortunately, there are some in our midst who look to reduce military funding at every possible turn. Fortunately, we have a President who shares our commitment to national security. Thanks to the Trump administration's tough negotiating, this deal provides the stability the Pentagon needs, including critical investments in military readiness. Compared to current law, it provides a larger increase in discretionary funding for defense than nondefense discretionary programs and would allow us to regain the ground lost under the Obama administration.

I appreciate the President's work, along with that of the House and the Senate, to deliver a budget deal that supports America's military, and I look forward to supporting this agreement later today and certainly later this week.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### AMENDING SECTION 327 OF THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT TO CLARIFY THAT NATIONAL URBAN SEARCH AND RESCUE RESPONSE SYSTEM TASK FORCES MAY INCLUDE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 639 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 639) to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 639) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.